

**FILED**

**JUN 10 2014**

**Clerk, U.S. District and  
Bankruptcy Courts**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Michael Lafayette Jackson,

Plaintiff,

v.

United States of America,

Defendant.

Civil Action No.

*14-992*

MEMORANDUM OPINION

This matter is before the Court on review of plaintiff's *pro se* complaint and application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The application will be granted and the case will be dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii) (requiring dismissal of a case upon a determination that the complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief may be granted).

Plaintiff is a resident of the District of Columbia suing the United States. He alleges, among other things, that "certain government agencies and individuals have committed fraud" and have "attempted to intimidate [him] to move from the Washington D.C. area." Compl. at 1. Plaintiff lists individuals residing in Maryland who he "believe[s] are to be or affiliated with" the Department of Homeland Security and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Plaintiff then recounts in a lengthy narrative various and seemingly unrelated "experience[s]" dating back to 1996 that the listed individuals allegedly "controlled." *Id.* at 2.

Plaintiff has demanded no relief. However, he "add[s]" that he has notified the Department of Justice "on this matter" but has not "heard back from them . . . ." *Id.* at 6. To the extent that plaintiff is seeking an investigation of his claims, the United States Attorney

General has absolute discretion in deciding whether to investigate claims for possible criminal or civil prosecution. As a general rule applicable to the circumstances of this case, such decisions are not subject to judicial review. *Shoshone-Bannock Tribes v. Reno*, 56 F.3d 1476, 1480-81 (D.C. Cir. 1995); *see accord Wightman-Cervantes v. Mueller*, 750 F. Supp. 2d 76, 81 (D.D.C. 2010) (citing cases); *Martinez v. U.S.*, 587 F. Supp. 2d 245, 248-49 (D.D.C. 2008) (same). Hence, this case will be dismissed. A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

Date: June 5, 2014



United States District Judge